

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in this application, of which claims 1, 4, 7, 8, 10, 12, 14, 15, 17 and 18 have been amended. No new claims have been added.

Claims 10 and 15 stand rejected under 35 USC §112, second paragraph, as incomplete.

Accordingly, claims 10 and 15 have been amended by adding the necessary structure cooperative language.

Thus, the 35 USC §112, second paragraph, rejection should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8-11, 13, and 15-18, stand rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over Applicants' Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "**APA**") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,380,655 to Ide et al. (hereinafter "**Ide et al**").

Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

The Examiner has admitted that **APA** does not disclose "capacitance in conjunction with the apparatus," but has cited **Ide et al** for teaching this feature.

Applicants respectfully disagree.

Column 7, lines 31-35 of **Ide et al** disclose:

The voltage of ac power produced by the power inverter 64 is transformed by the transformer 7 and is fed back to the ac system 9. When the charging voltage of the smoothing capacitor 63 exceeds a predetermined value, the power stored in the capacitor 63 is fed back through the transformer 7 to the ac system 9.

Thus, **Ide et al** teaches only that "the power stored in the capacitor 63 is fed back" when the charging voltage of the capacitor exceeds a predetermined value. This does not teach that a

correction of temporary current instruction depends on at least a value of capacitance at the output of the variable speed driving unit, as recited in claims 1, 8 and 9; or that a control signal is based on such a value of capacitance, as recited in claims 10 and 18; or that a capacitor correction signal is generated based on such a value of capacitance, as recited in claim 17.

Furthermore, both Art and Ide et al fail to teach, mention or suggest generation of a control signal based on a frequency component contained in an input signal and a remaining component of said input signal, as recited in claim 15.

Accordingly, claims 1, 8, 10, 15, 17 and 18 have been amended to clarify these distinctions.

Thus, the 35 USC §103(a) rejections should be withdrawn.

The Examiner has indicated that claims 4, 7, 12 and 14 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Claims 4, 7, 12 and 14 have been so amended.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-18, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP


William L. Brooks

Attorney for Applicant

Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/mla
Atty. Docket No. 011515
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

Enclosures: Substitute Abstract of the Disclosure
Amendment Transmittal

H:\HOME\etitia\WLB\01\011515\amendment nov 2003